FILED UNDER

SEAL

1	DAVID C. SHONKA	
2	Acting General Counsel SARAH WALDROP MICHELLE SCHAEFER	
3	Attorneys Federal Trade Commission	
4	600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Mailstop CC-9528	
5	Washington, DC 20580 Telephone: 202-326-3444 (Waldrop)	
6	Telephone: 202-326-3515 (Schaefer) Facsimile: 202-326-3197	
7	Email: swaldrop@ftc.gov, mschaefer@ftc.gov	
8	STEVEN W. MYHRE Acting United States Attorney	
9	BLAINE T. WELSH Assistant United States Attorney	
10	Nevada Bar No. 4790 333 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 5000	
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Phone: 702-388-6336	2:17-cv-02000-APG-GWF
12	Facsimile: 702-388-6787 Email: <u>blaine.welsh@usdoj.gov</u>	2.11
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission	
14 15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
17	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,	
18	Plaintiff,	Case No:
19	v.) FILED UNDER SEAL
20	REVMOUNTAIN, LLC, et al.,) PLAINTIFF FEDERAL TRADE) COMMISSION'S EMERGENCY EX
21	Defendants.	SEAL DOCKET AND ENTIRE FILE
22		AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
23)
24	Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") respectfully moves ex parte for an order	
25	temporarily sealing the entire docket and file in this matter, including this Motion, the Complaint	
26	for Permanent Injunction and Other Equitable Relief ("Complaint"), the Emergency Motion for	
27	Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO Motion"), and all other pleadings, exhibits, and	
28		1
		_

documents filed in support. A Court order sealing the entire docket until the Defendants are served, or until five (5) days after the Court enters the seal order, is necessary to prevent immediate and irreparable harm to the FTC's ability to obtain effective final relief in this matter.

In support of this Motion, the FTC states as follows:

- 1. The FTC requests that the seal of the entire docket and file remain in effect until it has served all Defendants, or until five (5) days following the entry of an order to seal the file, whichever occurs first.
- 2. As alleged in the Complaint, and described more fully in the TRO Motion and accompanying exhibits, this case concerns Defendants' online sales scam. Defendants tout cheap "trial" offers for personal-care products to obtain consumers' credit-card information. Defendants use deceptive websites to lure consumers in with \$1.03 offers of product samples. Once they obtain card numbers, defendants begin charging consumers about \$200 per month for regular shipments of products they did not order or want. Defendants' unauthorized charges have triggered more than a thousand consumer complaints and exceptionally high credit-card chargeback rates.
- 3. Defendants' deceptive practices violate Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §45(a), and Section 4 of the Restore Online Shoppers' Confidence Act ("ROSCA"), 15 U.S.C. § 8403.
- 4. As set forth in the Rule 65(b)(1) Certification of Plaintiff's counsel Sarah
 Waldrop in support of the TRO Motion, there is good cause for an order to temporarily seal the
 file and docket in this case. The FTC requests a temporary seal of the entire file for the same
 reason that it seeks a temporary restraining order pending a preliminary injunction hearing—
 namely, to maintain the *status quo* and to preserve the possibility of final relief.

- 5. A temporary seal will help ensure that Defendants do not receive premature notice of this action directly or through third parties. Entry of an *ex parte* order temporarily sealing the file is consistent with the purpose of Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b), which permits motions without notice to prevent "immediate irreparable injury, loss, or damage."
- 6. If Defendants become aware of the FTC's case before the FTC can secure Defendants' records and serve the TRO on third parties that hold Defendants' assets, such as banks and payment processors, there is substantial risk that Defendants might conceal or dissipate assets or destroy documents, frustrating the FTC's law enforcement efforts and the Court's ability to provide restitution to the victims of Defendants' unlawful scheme.
- 7. As detailed in the FTC's TRO Motion, Defendants' ongoing negative option marketing scheme demonstrates that they are likely to dissipate and hide assets and destroy evidence upon notice of the Complaint. Indeed, Blair McNea and his co-conspirators, Defendants Danielle Foss and Jennifer Johnson, take apparent steps to evade law enforcement detection though an intricate network of nested LLCs, bank accounts and continuous money transfers, dummy websites, and employees who provide cover to Defendants by using their own names to form LLCs and open merchant accounts.
- 8. In fact, McNea has a history of trying to sidestep law enforcement. In 2014, the FTC sought information from his companies in connection with litigation against an affiliate network McNea had hired. McNea abruptly abandoned the LLCs the FTC had asked about and closed all of his bank accounts. McNea told the FTC he was shutting down his business at that time, but instead, he merely reorganized his operation by conducting his business under new names and opening new accounts. He then continued to run the business in the same way, operating websites that ensnared consumers with deceptive "trial" offers.

- 9. The public's interest in preserving the Court's ability to award monetary relief outweighs its interest in having access to the judicial records of this matter during the short seal period.
- 10. Moreover, this seal is narrowly tailored to its express purpose of preventing notice prior to service. Many courts in this district have granted similar relief in FTC enforcement cases. See, e.g., FTC v. Health Formulas, LLC, et al., No. 01649 (D. Nev. Oct. 9, 2014) (granting application to seal entire docket pending service on defendants); FTC v. Ideal Fin. Sols., Inc., et al., No. 13-00143 (D. Nev. Jan. 30, 2011) (same); FTC v. Ivy Capital, Inc., et al., No. 11-00283 (D. Nev. Feb. 22, 2011) (same); FTC v. Grant Connect, LLC, et al., No. 09-01349 (D. Nev. July 28, 2009) (same); FTC v. Infusion Media, Inc., et al., No. 09-01112 (D. Nev. June 23, 2009) (same); FTC v. ERG Ventures, LLC, No. 06-00578 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2006) (same); FTC v. Global Net Sols., Inc., No. 05-0002 (D. Nev. Jan. 3, 2005) (same), FTC v. Moneymaker, No. 2:11-cv-00461 (D. Nev. Mar. 28, 2011) (same).
- 11. In light of the above, the FTC respectfully requests that the Court enter the accompanying proposed order to seal the entire file and docket in this matter until Defendants have been served, or until five (5) days following entry of the Court's sealing order, whichever occurs first.

Respectfully submitted this 24th day of July, 2017.

/s/ SARAH WALDROP
SARAH WALDROP
MICHELLE SCHAEFER

Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

1			
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
3	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
4	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,) Case No:	
5	Plaintiff,) Case 110.	
6	v.) FILED UNDER SEAL	
7	REVMOUNTAIN, LLC, et al.,	ORDER TO TEMPORARILY SEAL OCKET AND ENTIRE FILE	
8	Defendants.)	
9			
10		<i>,</i>	
11	THIS MATTER is before the Court upon Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission's		
12	Emergency Ex Parte Motion to Temporarily Seal the Docket and Entire File. The Court has		
13	considered the merits of said Motion. Accordingly, after due consideration, it is: ORDERED that Plaintiff's Emergency Ex Parte Motion to Temporarily Seal the Docket		
14			
15	and Entire File is hereby GRANTED . It is further:		
16			
17	ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is hereby DIRECTED to file and maintain said		
18	case under seal and to maintain the seal until the Defendants are served, or five (5) days after		
19	the Court enters the seal order, whichever occurs first, after which point the Clerk or the Court		
20	shall unseal the docket and entire file without further notice or hearing. Plaintiff shall notify the		
21	Clerk of the Court if it serves all Defendants before the expiration of the five (5) days.		
22	IT IS SO ORDERED		
23		0	
24		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
25			
26		DATED:	
27			
28 l			